UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/677,733	10/01/2003	Kevin H. Gardner	UTSD:1510	4887
23379 RICHARD AR	7590 05/05/200 ON OSMAN	EXAMINER		
4070 CALLE IS SAN CLEMEN	SABELLA	NOAKES, SUZANNE MARIE		
SAN CLEMEN	(1E, CA 92072		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1656	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/05/2008	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

RICHARD@SCI-TECH.COM jan@sci-tech.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/677,733	GARDNER ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SUZANNE M. NOAKES	1656		

	SUZANNE M. NOAKES	1656					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 11 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request				
<ul> <li>a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date</li> <li>b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A</li> </ul>	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth	in the final rejection, which	chever is later. In				
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (	b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	•	26(a) and the appropriat	o ovtonoion foo				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as							
set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL	''	and the Charles Office					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>11 March 2008</u> . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, to (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor			cause				
(b) $\square$ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below							
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		(1					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)		I be entered and an ex	xplanation of				
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: <u>4</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>3,5 and 6</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	•	, ,, ,					
<ul><li>11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.</li></ul>	t does NOT place the application in	o condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/S.M.N./	/David J. Steadman/						
Suzanne Noakes	Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1656					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The request for reconsideration in the reply filed on 4/11/08 has been fully considered, however, the amendment does not place the application in condition for allowance. The amendment filed on 4/11/08 relies at least in part on the Declaration filed under 37 CFR 1.132 by Gardner. However, said Declaration has not been entered for reasons noted above in item 9. Applicant's arguments in the amendment filed on 4/11/08 have been fully considered, particularly with respect to applicant's assertion that "To the eyes of an expert, the commentaries and conclusions of the Final Action are unwarranted and erroneous, and its analysis contains multiple and fundamental overstatements and technical inaccuracies" (remarks at p. 5, middle). However, as noted in MPEP 716.01(c).II, "The arguments of counsel cannot take the place of evidence in the record". in view of the non-entry of the amendment, particularly with respect to non-entry of the Gardner Declaration, applicant's arguments are not found persuasive to overcome the outstanding rejection(s) as set forth in the final Office action mailed on 12/11/07 for the reasons of record stated therein.